

**Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
September 26, 2002**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group on September 26, 2002 at Mooretown Rancheria in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 4	Oroville Relicensing Collaborative Draft Schedule for Plenary and Work Group Meetings: August 2002 – July 2003
Attachment 5	Household Resident Questionnaire Results
Attachment 6	Lake Oroville Recreation Surveys – Preliminary Results

### **Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations and reviewed the desired outcomes of the meeting. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3. The Facilitator also distributed a revised meeting schedule to the Work Group (see Attachment 4).

### **Action Items – June 27, 2002 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting**

A summary of the June 27, 2002 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of the action item from that meeting as follows:

<b>Action Item #R50:</b>	Review the Cumulative Impacts Approach/ESA guidance document for discussion at a future Work Group meeting.
Status:	The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group received a copy of the guidance document at the June 2002 Work Group meeting. Although the participants were asked to review the document, no immediate actions were required. Doug Rischbieter of DWR spoke to the Work Group regarding cumulative impacts in the context of the recreation studies. He informed the Work Group that once all of the recreation studies are underway, there will be a general assessment of cumulative impacts. It has been concluded that no cumulative impact-specific recreation study will be undertaken; however, there may be the need for some type of Year 2 data collection to address this issue.

### **Preliminary Survey Results**

John Baas with EDAW provided an overview and update of the recreation survey process. The current (2002) recreation season, which ran from Memorial Day weekend to Labor Day weekend, is complete and some preliminary survey results are available. The response goals for the first season included: 1,200-1,500 on-site surveys at the Oroville Facilities; 100 surveys at each of the three off-site reservoirs (Black Butte, Shasta, and Berryessa); and 400 household telephone surveys. Overall, the response rates have been good, meeting or exceeding the goals referenced

above. In fact, approximately 2,000 on-site surveys have been administered at the Oroville Facilities this season alone. Of these, roughly 90-95 percent agreed to complete the mail-back survey; however, only about 38% (776) of the mail-back surveys have been returned to date. Although it is likely that the mail-back surveys will continue to come in, there is a potential shortfall of 500 mail-back surveys relative to project goals. At the current response rate, approximately an additional 1,200-1,500 on-site surveys would need to be administered to attain mail-back survey goals. Generally, if project goals related to mail-back survey response rates cannot be attained, the consultant team and Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group may need to revisit acceptable standard error rates associated with these results.

A preliminary summary of the Household Survey and On-Site, Off-Site, and Mail-Back surveys were presented to the Work Group (see more detailed discussion below). The Work Group discussed the results as they were presented, noting any surprises in the data. After the results were presented, the Work Group discussed several outstanding issues, including the need for additional surveys in 2003 and other recreation data that will be acquired as part of the relicensing process. In terms of additional surveys, DWR and the consultant team is committed to conducting surveys through Memorial Day weekend 2003. Conducting any additional surveys beyond those already agreed to will need to consider survey costs, project goals, and diminishing improvements in statistical accuracy. Another goal for the consultants is to make sure that all 18 of the user groups are accounted for in the survey process; the strategy for doing so includes targeting specific user groups through venues such as club meetings and special events. In terms of other data sources, lake boat counts and trail counter information will also be used to supplement the survey data.

#### *Household Survey Results*

Jim Vogel with EDAW presented the Household Survey results to the Work Group. A hard copy of the presentation was distributed to the participants (see Attachment 5). CIC Research administered the telephone survey under sub-contract to the Harza/EDAW consulting team. The total sample size was 400. All survey participants must have met all of the following screening criteria: (1) 6-month residency in California; (2) at least 18 years old; (3) at least 3 days of northern California lake or river recreation during the last year; and (4) heard of Lake Oroville. In general, three types of survey questions were administered as part of the Household Survey: general recreation questions; Oroville-specific questions for participants who have visited the Lake Oroville area before; and Oroville-specific questions for participants who have never visited the Lake Oroville area. The participants discussed the results of the Household Survey and clarification was provided where necessary. Details of the survey results can be found in Attachment 5.

#### *On-Site, Off-Site, and Mail-Back Survey Results*

Jim reported that at the time of the Recreation and Socioeconomics September Work Group meeting, approximately 300 of the 2,000 on-site surveys have been entered into the database, leaving roughly 1,700 to be input. The initial 300 surveys, along with portions of the off-site reservoir and mail-back surveys, had been analyzed and the preliminary results were presented to the Work Group. Similar to the Household Survey, these survey results were summarized in a hard copy of the presentation that was distributed to the Work Group (see Attachment 6). It was stressed that these results are very preliminary (300 out of 2,000 surveys) and final results may be different than what the preliminary data indicated. Further, due to the small sample size, anomalies across sub-areas were evident.

#### **Interim Projects Update**

Doug Rischbieter (DWR Resource Area Manager) provided an update on the Interim Projects associated with the relicensing process. As an overview, the participants were reminded that interim projects are organized into four categories (Category I, II, III and IV) ranging from the

easiest to implement (Category I) to those projects that are considered ongoing and require substantial study (Category IV).

### ***Category I***

- Six locations have been identified for restroom upgrades. Purchase contract for equipment is being reviewed by the Department of General Services.
- DPR has installed corrals and pens at Loafer Creek Equestrian Camp. Access road paving is currently in progress.
- DWR Oroville Field Division Civil Maintenance has completed expansion of Group Staging Areas' lower parking area and surfaced it with aggregate rock.
- Waiting on DPR for new layout of Bidwell Exhibit.
- OFD Civil Maintenance has completed excavation phase of parking area at Saddle Dam and surfaced area with road base. DWR will work with DPR on layout of facilities.
- OFD Civil Maintenance will install guardrail at Lake Oroville Overlook area. DWR Office of Water Education is working on interpretive signs.
- OFD Civil Maintenance has completed earthwork and aggregate base placement at the Shooting Range access road and parking area. Planning to install shooting tables and shade ramadas.
- Warning system for water releases is still in planning stage by OFD staff.
- OFD Civil Maintenance has completed some minor improvements at Model Airplane site including fence posts, minor grading, picnic tables and shade ramada, and paving the runway.
- Doug Rischbieter forwarded information to Field Division regarding the reseeding of Oroville Dam face with California poppies.
- Dangermond Group has produced preliminary layout and cost estimates for improving day use parks and fish hatchery landscaping.

### ***Category II***

- There are no further plans for a demonstration parallel mountain bike trail.
- Field survey work (property line determination) has been completed at the vehicle access location at Lakeland Boulevard. DWR is awaiting the completion of a Title Report, expected by the end of September. No official contact with Union Pacific railroad yet.
- No work has been performed on the tournament water ski site pending determination of alternate location; the Dangermond Group has reviewed the pros and cons of several potential sites.

### ***Category III***

No planning, environmental, or design work completed on Category III projects.

## **Category IV**

- Under increased contract with Oroville Chamber of Commerce to promote existing facilities. Considering billboards and additional signs.
- The first set of classes for children was held in mid-August as part of the Boater Safety Training program. OFD had a one-time agreement with Feather River Recreation and Parks District to fund this program, but plans are already underway to expand the successful program next year. The organization "U.S. Sailing" conducted a water safety training class for trainers; at least seven local boaters participated with tuition paid for by DWR.
- Currently applying for a Land and Water Conservation Fund grant to fund some interim recreation projects.

## **Youth Aquatic Camp Video**

The Work Group viewed a video summarizing the youth aquatic camp activities sponsored in part by DWR.

## **Socioeconomics Technical Review Team Overview**

Tom Wegge with TCW Economics provided the participants with an overview of the Socioeconomics Technical Review Team (TRT). He reviewed the background behind the formation of the TRT and reminded the participants that Patricia Watters representing MWD had suggested that the two socioeconomic studies (SP-R18 and SP-R19) could use a smaller advisory group with technical insight into socioeconomic to assist with implementation details. The focus of the TRT is to provide guidance on the implementation of the two socioeconomic study plans, not to revisit the objectives or the general methodology associated with these plans.

The TRT's first meeting was held on September 26, 2002, and included various participants with different levels of economic expertise. Tom explained that Hank Robison, the lead on developing the community impact models described in SP-R18 was there to briefly describe the modeling effort; other attendees included representatives from Butte County, the State Water Contractors, DWR, and the consultant team. Mr. Robison demonstrated technical aspects of his community modeling system recently applied to the Lake Tahoe basin.

Tom explained that the TRT also discussed the Background Report task in SP-R18. The study plan does not contain specific objectives for the Background Report, so the TRT discussed a range of objectives and data sources for the report.

Michael Pierce representing Butte County expressed his opinion that there are other socioeconomic issues that are not being evaluated in the two socioeconomic study plans that need to be addressed elsewhere in the context of the relicensing process; no other forum to address these issues has been identified. Doug Rischbieter responded that SP-R18 and SP-R19 represent the results of a long collaborative process and DWR feels confident that they should provide the information required for a FERC application. Other issues may be addressed elsewhere during the process (such as settlement negotiations) but currently there is no plan to add additional socioeconomic studies. Mr. Pierce, a participant in the Task Force that developed SP-R18 and SP-R19, stated he had come away from the Study Plan development process with a different understanding of some of the language in SP-R18 and SP-R19 (specifically, "...economic activity generated...by the operations and maintenance of the Oroville Facilities..." in SP-R19).

## **Study Implementation Update**

John Baas provided a brief update on the status of all of the Recreation and Socioeconomics study plans. All 19 plans have been approved, with the four critical path studies (SP-R7, SP-R9, SP-R13, and SP-R18) already underway. In addition, task orders have been signed for the following studies: SP-R1, SP-R2, SP-R3, SP-R4, SP-R8, SP-R10, and SP-R14. SP-R1 (Public and Private Vehicular Access), SP-R2 (Recreation Safety Assessment), and SP-R10 (Recreation Facility and Condition Inventory) are expected to commence in the Fall 2002.

## **Next Steps/Next Meeting**

Based on the implementation schedule for the various recreation and socioeconomic study plans, the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to cancel the October 2002 meeting to allow the consulting team to further collect and analyze data. The next regularly scheduled meeting will be held in November. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to meet on:

Date: November 21, 2002  
Time: 6-10 pm  
Location: Kelly Ridge Golf Course meeting room

## **Agreements Made**

1. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to cancel its October 2002 meeting.

## **Action Items**

The following list of action items identified by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

- *No Action Items were identified at the meeting.*